

1987

# State of Utah v. David Crockett Stewart : Brief of Respondent

Utah Court of Appeals

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_ca1](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1)

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Court of Appeals; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Robert L. Froerer; Public Defender Association; Attorney for Appellant.

David L. Wilkinson; Attorney General; L.A. Dever; Assistant Attorney General; Attorneys for Respondent.

---

## Recommended Citation

Brief of Respondent, *Utah v. Stewart*, No. 870219 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1987).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_ca1/458](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1/458)

This Brief of Respondent is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Court of Appeals Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at [http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah\\_court\\_briefs/policies.html](http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html). Please contact the Repository Manager at [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu) with questions or feedback.

UTAH COURT OF APPEALS  
BRIEF

JTAM  
DOCUMENT  
KFU  
50  
.A10  
DOCKET

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

870219

STATE OF UTAH,

:

Plaintiff-Respondent, : Case No. 870219-CA

v. :

DAVID CROCKETT STEWART, : Category No. 2

Defendant-Appellant. :

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

APPEAL FROM A CONVICTION OF THEFT, A SECOND  
DEGREE FELONY, IN VIOLATION OF UTAH CODE ANN.  
§ 76-4-404 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT, IN AND FOR WEBER COUNTY, STATE OF  
UTAH, THE HONORABLE RONALD O. HYDE, JUDGE,  
PRESIDING.

DAVID L. WILKINSON  
Attorney General  
L. A. DEVER  
Assistant Attorney General  
236 State Capitol  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Attorneys for Respondent

ROBERT L. FROERER  
Public Defender Assoc.  
205 26th Street  
Suite 13  
Ogden, Utah 84401

Attorney for Appellant

RECEIVED  
NOV 30 1987  
870219-CA  
COURT OF APPEALS

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

---

STATE OF UTAH, :  
Plaintiff-Respondent, : Case No. 870219-CA  
v. :  
DAVID CROCKETT STEWART, : Category No. 2  
Defendant-Appellant. :

---

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

- - - - -

APPEAL FROM A CONVICTION OF THEFT, A SECOND  
DEGREE FELONY, IN VIOLATION OF UTAH CODE ANN.  
§ 76-4-404 IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
COURT, IN AND FOR WEBER COUNTY, STATE OF  
UTAH, THE HONORABLE RONALD O. HYDE, JUDGE,  
PRESIDING.

DAVID L. WILKINSON  
Attorney General  
L. A. DEVER  
Assistant Attorney General  
236 State Capitol  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Attorneys for Respondent

ROBERT L. FROERER  
Public Defender Assoc.  
205 26th Street  
Suite 13  
Ogden, Utah 84401

Attorney for Appellant

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
JURISDICTION.....	1
STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED ON APPEAL.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT	
POINT I    THE EVIDENCE WAS SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT DEFENDANT'S CONVICTION.....	4
CONCLUSION.....	6

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES CITED

	Page
<u>State v. Booker</u> , 709 P.2d 342 (Utah 1985).....	4
<u>State v. Carlson</u> , 635 P.2d 72 (Utah 1981).....	5
<u>State v. Michael Lupe Duran</u> , case no. 870054-CA.....	1
<u>State v. Gabaldon</u> , 735 P.2d 410 (Utah 1987).....	4
<u>State v. Howell</u> , 649 P.2d 91 (Utah 1982).....	5
<u>State v. Isaacson</u> , 704 P.2d 555 (Utah 1985).....	5

### STATUTES AND RULES

Utah Code Ann. § 76-6-404 (1953 as amended).....	1, 6
Utah Code Ann. § 78-2a-3(2)(e) (Supp. 1986).....	1

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

---

STATE OF UTAH, :  
Plaintiff-Respondent, : Case No. 870219-CA  
v. :  
DAVID CROCKETT STEWART, : Category No. 2  
Defendant-Appellant. :

---

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT  
- - - - -

JURISDICTION

This appeal is from a conviction for the offense of theft, a second degree felony, after a trial in the Second Judicial District Court. This court has jurisdiction to hear the appeal under Utah Code Ann. § 78-2a-3(2)(e) (Supp. 1986).

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED ON APPEAL

The defendant is appealing a conviction of second degree theft on the grounds that the evidence presented at trial was insufficient to support a finding of guilty.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Defendant, David Crockett Stewart, was charged with theft, a second degree felony, in violation of Utah Code Ann. § 76-6-404 (1953 as amended). After a jury trial, defendant was found guilty as charged. Defendant was sentenced by Judge Ronald O. Hyde on January 8, 1987, to the Utah State Prison for a term of one to fifteen years.

This appeal is a companion case to State of Utah v. Michael Lupe Duran, case no. 870054-CA, also pending on appeal. The issue raised in both appeals relating to the sufficiency of evidence are identical.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 29, 1986, Marty Taylor's home was broken into (R. 4-6). Eight guns were stolen, along with jewelry and \$200.00 in cash (R. 6-7). Defendant's car was seen outside the house on the day and at the time of the theft (R. 19). One set of footprints outside the home at the point of entry matched defendant's footprints. (R. 87).

On that same day, Marty Taylor contacted Rodney Bennett, an employee at Mountain Oil, to have him watch for the stolen property (R. 27). Mr. Taylor approached Mr. Bennett because sometimes stolen property is sold around Mountain Oil (R. 13).

On October 30, 1987, at about 4:00 o'clock p.m. Kenny Nevarez, a friend of defendant's, came into Mountain Oil trying to sell rifles to Mr. Bennett (R. 28-29). When Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Nevarez about the prices Mr. Nevarez said he would have to check on the price from the other fellows (R. 29). Bennett and Nevarez went around the back of the station to defendant's car, where defendant and Duran were, the trunk was opened and Mr. Nevarez showed Mr. Bennett the rifles (R. 30-31). Mr. Bennett recognized the rifles as the ones stolen from Mr. Taylor (R. 30-31). Defendant remained inside the car, and Duran came to the trunk (R. 32). Time and terms of the sale were set up at that time (R. 32).

After Nevarez and defendant left, Mr. Bennett contacted Mr. Taylor about seeing the guns and the sale (R. 38). Mr. Taylor contacted the police (R. 14). The police then set up a

plan to arrest the suspects when they tried to sell the rifles that night at 10:00 o'clock that night (R. 59).

At 10:00 o'clock defendant and Duran returned to Mountain Oil, while defendant waited in the car, Duran went into the station to get Mr. Bennett (R. 41). Mr. Bennett introduced two narcotics agents, Kelly Call and Mitch Beckstead, as friends who were interested in buying the rifles (R. 41). The four individuals, went around to the rear of the station where defendant popped open the trunk from the inside of the car (R. 155). Agent Beckstead renegotiated a deal with defendant which included using cocaine as payment for the rifles (R. 98).

Defendant argues that Mr. Nevarez asked them to take the rifles to Mountain Oil the first time (R. 119). Defendant claims that he went to Mountain Oil so he could collect a debt of \$50.00 from Mr. Nevarez and that he thought Mr. Nevarez would be there that night (R. 149, 153). Defendant denies having renegotiating a deal with the narcotics agent (R. 156).

#### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The evidence was sufficient to convict defendant of theft. Defendant had the opportunity to present evidence and cross examine witnesses. It then became the function of the jury to weigh the evidence and credibility of the witnesses in rendering a verdict.



## **ARGUMENT**

### **POINT\_I**

#### **THE EVIDENCE WAS SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT DEFENDANT'S CONVICTION.**

Defendant asserts that the evidence produced at trial was insufficient for the jury to convict him.

This Court has adopted the following standard of review when considering a challenge of the sufficiency of the evidence:

The standard for determining sufficiency of the evidence is that the evidence be "so inconclusive or so inherently improbable that reasonable minds could not reasonably believe defendant had committed a crime." State v. Romero, 554 P.2d 216, 219 (Utah 1976). In determining whether evidence is sufficient, the Court will review the evidence and all inferences which may reasonably be drawn from it in the light most favorable to the jury verdict. State v. Kerekes, 622 P.2d 1161, 1168 (Utah 1980). Unless there is a clear showing of lack of evidence, the jury verdict will be upheld. State v. Logan, 563 P.2d 811, 814 (Utah 1977).

State v. Gabaldon, 735 P.2d 410, 412 (Utah 1987). As noted in State v. Booker, 709 P.2d 342 (Utah 1985):

In reviewing the conviction, we do not substitute our judgment for that of the jury. "It is the exclusive function of the jury to weigh the evidence and to determine the credibility of the witnesses . . . ." State v. Lamm, Utah, 606 P.2d 229, 231 (1980); accord State v. Linden, Utah, 657 P.2d 1364, 1366 (1983). So long as there is some evidence, including reasonable inferences, from which findings of all the requisite elements of the crime can reasonably be made, our inquiry stops.

Id. at 345 (citation omitted). And, even if the Court views the evidence as less than wholly conclusive, or if contradictory evidence or conflicting inferences exist, the

verdict should be upheld. State v. Howell, 649 P.2d 91, 97 (Utah 1982). In short, "on conflicting evidence the Court is obliged to accept the version of the facts which supports the verdict." State v. Isaacson, 704 P.2d 555, 556 (Utah 1985) (citing State v. Howell, 649 P.2d at 93).

Defendant's insufficiency argument is little more than a request for this Court to engage in de novo review of the weight of the evidence and the credibility of the witnesses, and then to substitute its judgment for that of the jury. As is evident from the authority cited above, this Court and the Utah Supreme Court have stated that they will not review a criminal case in that fashion.

Defendant argues that Nevarez gave the rifles to defendant but that defendant only took the rifles to recover a \$50.00 dollar debt. In testimony given by Rodney Bennett, he stated that the agreement of defendant and Duran, "the other fellows" (R. 29) was necessary in setting the price and time of the sale. The narcotic agents, Mitch Beckstead and Kelly Call, testified that defendant was willing to change the terms of the deal without asking Nevarez. While defendant testified otherwise the jury was not required to believe his testimony. "The court could reasonably believe the officer's testimony (and not defense testimony). . . ." State v. Carlson, 635 P.2d 72, 74-75 (Utah 1981). Finally, Joe Bunn identified the defendant's car as the one in front of Marty Taylor's home at the time of the theft.

Defendant argues that there is insufficient evidence to prove that he was the one who broke into Mr. Taylor's house. He

was not convicted of burglary, but of theft. Utah Code Ann. § 76-6-404 (1953 as amended) requires that the defendant "obtains or exercises unauthorized control over the property of another with intent to deprive him thereof". Defendant was exercising unauthorized control. The rifles were in his car and he transported them to Mountain Oil twice. He meant to deprive Marty Taylor of the rifles. He was selling them to the narcotic agents.

#### CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing argument, the State respectfully requests the Court to affirm defendant's conviction.


DATED this 30 day of November, 1987.

DAVID L. WILKINSON  
Attorney General

  
L. A. DEVER  
Assistant Attorney General

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that four true and accurate copies of the foregoing Brief of Respondent were mailed, postage prepaid, to Robert L. Froerer, Public Defender Assoc., 205 26th Street, Suite 13, Ogden, Utah 84401, this 30 day of November, 1987.

  
-----